

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Examiner's Office Action dated March 17, 2005, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15, 17, 25-29 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,509,693 to Yonezawa; and rejected claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,811,920 to Wada.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicants have amended the claims in order to more particularly define the invention taking into consideration the outstanding Official Action.

Claim 34 has been amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection. Claims 1, 5, 15, 27 and 34 have been further amended to more clearly define the invention, while claim 26 has been cancelled.

Support for the amendments is found on page 10, lines 11-14; page 10, lines 21-23; page 15, lines 5-8; page 19, lines 5-9 and et al. of the original specification. The amendments therefore do not constitute "new matter."

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,509,693 to Yonezawa

The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15, 17, 25, 27-29 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,509,693 to Yonezawa (hereinafter, referred to as the '693 patent) is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the '693 patent was filed after the priority date of the present application. The filing date of the

'693 patent is **August 14, 2001**, while the present application claims priority to two applications respectfully dated **February 20, 2001** and **June 28, 2001**. Verified translations of the two priority documents are attached hereto.

The claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15, 17, 25, 27-29 and 34, which are readable on Figs. 1A-13C, are all disclosed in the Japanese applications, on which the foreign priority was claimed. It should be noted that Figs. 1A-8C (and descriptions related thereto) of the present invention are disclosed in Figs. 1-8 and the specification of the February 20 priority document, and Figs. 9A-13C (and descriptions related thereto) of the present application are disclosed in Figs. 1-5 and the specification of the June 28 priority document.

Since the '693 does not qualify as a proper reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for the claimed subject matter, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,811,920 to Wada

The rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,811,920 to Wada (hereinafter, referred to as '920) is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the '920 patent fails to disclose or suggest an electron tube in which a linear member is connected to a metal film at the same position where an additional member is welded to one of the opposite surfaces of the metal film, and further, that the welding connects the one end of the at least one linear member to the at least one metal film. In addition, the '920 patent fails to disclose or suggest the claimed tension applying portion, which is part of the linear member.

In particular, claim 1 positively recites: at least one metal film formed on a base; at least one linear member provided above the base, wherein at least a part of said at least one linear member is a tension force applying portion for exerting a tension force; at least one spacer for defining a distance between said at least one linear member and the base; and at least one additional member for connecting one end of said at least one linear member to said at least one metal film, wherein said at least one metal film includes a generally flat part, the entire flat part of said at least one metal film having two opposite surfaces, said at least one additional member being welded to one of the opposite surfaces wherein said one end of said at least one linear member is connected to said at least one metal film at the same position where said at least one additional member is welded to said one of the opposite surfaces, and the other opposite surface being substantially parallel with and in direct contact with the base. As a result of this positively recited arrangement, it is possible to connect each of the additional member, the linear member, and the metal film by a single welding, which greatly reduces the production time and manufacturing cost of the electron tube. The '920 fails to disclose that the linear member is connected to the metal film at the same position where the additional member is welded to one of the opposite surfaces of the metal film, and further, that the welding connects said one end of said at least one linear member to said at least one metal film.

According to the Examiner, the members of reference numeral 3a and 3b in Figs. 3A and 3B of the '920 patent correspond to the additional member of the present invention. This interpretation of the '920 patent is incorrect since one end portion of the members 3a and 3b is connected to the metal film, while the other end portion of the members 3a and 3b is connected to the linear member. Accordingly, in accordance with '920, the connection position of the

linear member and the metal film is **different** from the connection position of the additional member and the metal film. Therefore, in accordance with the '920 patent, it is impossible to connect the three members by a single welding, which results in a long production time and an increased manufacturing cost in comparison with the present invention.

Further, in accordance with the present invention, at least a part of the linear member is a tension force applying portion for exerting a tension force (e.g., a coil portion). In contrast, '920 neither discloses nor suggests providing a tension force applying portion as a part of the linear member, since the anchor of '920 is not a part of the linear member. As a result, in the arrangement disclosed in the '920 patent, the thermal expansion of the linear member during electrification may result in a short circuit with another electrode, or the linear member may come into contact with the fluorescent substance of the anode electrode, thereby causing diffusion thereof, due to the lack of a tension force applying portion for exerting a tension force. The present invention does not have such drawbacks.

Consequently, the subject matter recited in claim 34 is neither anticipated nor suggested by the '920 patent. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.


Appl. No. 10/076,516
Amendment dated:
Reply to OA of: March 17, 2005

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this is a full and complete response to the Office Action. For the reasons discussed above, applicants now respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in complete condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejections be withdrawn; and that claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-15, 17, 25, 27-29 and 34 be allowed in their present forms. If the Examiner feels that any issues that remain require discussion, he is kindly invited to contact applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC


By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: July 18, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: (703) 683-0500